DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 507 SO 000 391

AUTHOR Tucker, Jan L.
TITLE Social Studies Projects and Teacher Educators: Creative Tension?
INSTITUTION National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 70
NOTE 22p.; Presented at the Annual Convention, National Council for the Social Studies, New York, New York, November 26, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes, Conflict Resolution, *Curriculum Development, Curriculum Planning, Diffusion, Educational Trends, Instructional Innovation, *Methods Teachers, *Projects, Role Conflict, *Social Studies, *Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Education, Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *New Social Studies

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to inquire into the impact of the new social studies (NSS) as percieved by social studies methods teachers. They agree with many of the values of the NSS and the curriculum projects (which they tend to equate), but they want the developmental role shifted from the projects to the teachers. They see the NSS as overly academic, cerebral, and teacher-centered and want more emphasis on student interests, community activities, social action, and the affective domain. Methods teachers in schools of education are more dissatisfied with NSS than those who are appointed to academic departments. Dissatisfaction might be explained by one or a combination of three different theories: obsolescence, role conflict, or value conflict. The latter is probably the most explanatory and describes the situation most difficult to deal with because it reflects fundamental differences about the nature of a good social studies program. (These profiles are detailed in the author's statistics, appended, from a survey of social studies teacher educators.) Author/DJB)

ED0 45507

Helburn

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Symposium: The Social Studies Projects and Teachers of Teachers: Critical Issues

(CUFG Meeting, NCSS, New York, November 1970)

"Social Studies Projects and Teacher Educators: Creative Tension?"

Remarks by:

Jan L. Tucker
Stanford University
November 1970

SO 000 391

SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECTS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS: CREATIVE TENSION?

Over the past decade, it has become increasingly commonplace to acknowledge the important impact of the social studies materials projects upon social studies education. However, it is now more clear that not all members of the profession agree that the impact of the projects has been fully in the best interests of social studies education. A recent survey of a national sample of teachers of pre-service secondary teachers indicates that many teacher educators are rather uneasy about what they perceive to be some of the contributions of the national materials development projects to social studies education. The purpose of this paper is to explore the issues between social studies projects and teacher educators, as these are viewed from the standpoint of teacher educators.

We shall seek answers to the following questions: 1) How do methods educators perceive the relationship between the materials projects and themselves? 2) What may account for the fact that methods teachers see major differences between the projects and themselves? 3) What steps might be taken to channel the tensions toward constructive ends? I will deal with the third question in the context of the second.

How do methods educators perceive the relationship between the materials projects and themselves?

The data and interpretations for answering this question are drawn from the survey mentioned earlier. My purpose in this study was three-fold: 1) to identify the major characteristics of the so-called "new" social studies (NSS as perceived by methods teachers engaged in the preparation

of secondary, pre-service social studies teachers; 2) to compare these are-being emphasized perceptions with what methods teachers think ought-to-be emphasized; and 3) to discover if there is any relationship between what methods teachers think should be happening in the field and such variables as the type of academic training, length of service as a secondary teacher, and the type of academic appointment held by a methods teacher.

A basic finding of the study is that methods teachers see a distinct division of labor within the NSS with respect to what can be labeled the "developmental" and "educational" roles. On the one hand, methods teachers rank the materials projects as the most important source of the basic ideas associated with the NSS. (See Appendix I, Table 2). In the minds of methods teachers the projects, more than any other group, have served the "developmental" role for the NSS. In fact, the materials projects and the NSS are practically synonymous.

Conversely, methods educators do not see themselves in a major "developmental" role. But not surprisingly, they do consider their own methods courses to be serving the primary "educational" function for pre-service teachers. (See Appendix I, Table 1). To the degree that the NSS has found its way into methods classes, we can conclude that the typical pre-service teacher is being introduced to the NSS by an individual who has not made any significant "developmental" contributions to the NSS.

Looking at the "ought-to-be" profile we find that methods teachers tend to be very displeased with the current division of labor. (See Appendix I, Table 2). While they wish to retain the upper hand with respect to the "educational" role, they prefer that the "developmental" role be dramatically shifted away from the USOE and NSF projects and placed

in the hands of classroom teachers. Interestingly, methods teachers do not believe that their own role should include much curriculum development, even less in fact than is presently the case.

Disagreement over the appropriate source of curriculum development is not the only dissatisfaction. Methods teachers believe the projects have over-emphasized certain educational objectives and values at the expense of others that are equally, if not more important. (See Appendix II & III). Methods teachers would like to see significantly (X^2, $p < .05$) increased emphasis on:

1. Patriotic Values compared with Values of Scientific Inquiry.
2. "Open-ended" Divergent Inquiry c/w "Closed" Convergent Inquiry.
3. Controversial Topics c/w Non-controversial Topics.
4. Value Commitment c/w Value Clarification.
5. Value-included Inquiry c/w Value-excluded Inquiry.
6. Philosophy c/w Social Science.
7. Human Significance c/w Human Efficiency.
8. Comparative History c/w National History.
9. The Future c/w the Present.
10. Social Studies c/w Social Science.
11. Interdisciplinary Curricula c/w Separate Discipline Curricula.
12. Individuals c/w Social Systems.
13. Affective Domain c/w Cognitive Domain.
14. Reading Skill c/w Discussion Skill.
15. Community Activities c/w Classroom Activities.
16. Teacher-developed Content c/w Pre-packaged Content.
17. Self-concept Development c/w Academic Achievement.
18. Teaching Methodology c/w Curriculum Development.
19. Academically Below-average Students c/w Academically Above-Average Students.
20. Melioration of Social Problems c/w Knowledge of Academic Disciplines.
21. Local Curriculum Development c/w National Curriculum Development.
22. History as a Humanistic Discipline c/w History as a Scientific Discipline.
23. Normative Problems c/w Descriptive Problems.
24. Student Interests c/w Academic Disciplines.
25. General Education Values c/w Scholarly Research Values.
26. Heterogeneous Classes c/w Homogeneous Classes.

These expressed areas of dissatisfaction do not add up to an entirely clear or consistent profile. For instance, it is difficult to see how methods

teachers can simultaneously argue for more emphasis on patriotic values and greater emphasis on "open-ended" divergent inquiry. But it is also very evident that methods teachers are dissatisfied with the scholarly, cognitive, "structure-of-the discipline" approach to social studies education and they would like to see relatively greater attention given to the normative, interdisciplinary, affective, and community-centered aspects of social studies education.

Methods educators are not a homogeneous group. Attitudes toward what ought to be happening in the social studies tend to be closely related to the type of department in which the methods educator holds his appointment. Two-thirds (62) in the sample held appointments in departments or schools of education. One-third (32) held other types of appointments such as history or social science departments, or joint appointments. These two groups have distinctly different conceptions of social studies education. Methods teachers holding appointments in schools of education tend to want significantly more emphasis:

		X^2
1.	Student Interests compared with Academic Disciplines.	($p < .001$)
2.	Social Action c/w Social Science.	($p < .01$)
3.	Homogeneous Classes c/w Heterogeneous Classes	($p < .02$)
4.	Self-concept Development c/w Academic Achievement	($p < .01$)
5.	Political Efficacy c/w Political Knowledge	($p < .01$)
6.	Local Curriculum Development c/w National Curriculum Teaching Development (USOE, NSF, etc.)	($p < .01$)
7.	Methodology c/w Curriculum Materials Development.	($p < .05$)
8.	Interdisciplinary Curricula c/w Separate Discipline Curricula	($p < .10$)
9.	Affective Domain c/w Cognitive Domain	($p < .001$)
10.	Discussion Skill c/w Reading Skill	($p < .001$)
11.	Melioration of Social Problems c/w Knowledge of Academic Disciplines	($p < .01$)
12.	The Future c/w The Past	($p < .001$)
13.	The Present c/w The Past	($p < .01$)

And methods teachers with appointments in schools of education want:

14. less emphasis on historical content ($p < .05$)
15. more emphasis on the assumption that the classroom teacher is the key agent for developing and promoting major curricular changes. ($p. < .01$)
16. more emphasis on student-planned goals and activities ($p. < .10$)
17. less emphasis on curriculum development viewed as a process of "adoption of pre-packaged curricula" by local schools, departments, teachers, etc. ($p. < .02$)

There seems to be something about an appointment in a school of education that is associated with greater dissatisfaction regarding what the materials projects are thought to be doing; on the other hand, if a methods educator holds his appointment in an academic department, he tends to be more in agreement with the perceived activities of the projects. Those who hold appointments in education departments consistently take a much more student-centered, social-action stance. A methods teacher with an academic appointment is much more likely to assume a scholarly, cognitive, discipline-centered approach to the social studies. In any event, the important finding is the fact that among methods educators we can find two groups with rather distinctly different values about what ought to be going on in the social studies.

In summary, teacher educators reject the project notion that curriculum development should take place outside of particular educational situations. As a corollary, teacher educators, particularly those holding appointments in a school of education, tend to prefer an interdisciplinary curriculum designed around the interests, beliefs, values, and life experience of students. They see the project-centered NSS over-emphasizing such characteristics as separate academic disciplines, homogeneous grouping, and cognitive goals; in short, too much emphasis on the "structure of a discipline" approach.

Given the existing hiatus, can the profession assume that the materials and ideas of the projects have found their way into pre-service methods classes to any great extent? If not, why not? Might it be that methods teachers have resisted the materials? Or, maybe the projects in one way or another have ignored or deliberately circumvented methods teachers. Have the projects viewed their role as strictly "developmental" to the exclusion of any "educational" role? If they have seen an "educational" role for themselves, has the focus been primarily on in-service education to the exclusion of pre-service education? Or, in another vein, if the materials in fact are being used by pre-service methods teachers, are they being introduced to the prospective teachers in ways that fit the intent of the developers?

At the best, in my judgment, the materials of the projects have been used by pre-service methods teachers in a very haphazard and disorganized fashion; at the worst, they have not been used at all, perhaps even openly resisted. In any event, pre-service methods classes have not been an important agent for implementing and maintaining the NSS in the elementary and secondary schools.

<u>What may account for the fact that methods teachers see major differences between the projects and themselves? What steps might be taken to channel the tensions toward constructive ends?</u>

What are possible causes of the hiatus between the projects and methods teachers? Solutions ought to be compatible with the causes. In fact, the existing hiatus can not be judged desirable or undesirable unless we have some sense of the causes.

There are at least three possible explanations, all of which may call for a different solution. The first explanation is that the NSS products

developed by the projects and now being disseminated by commercial publishers have caused the knowledge and skills or methods teachers to become obsolete. This shall be labeled the "obsolescence" theory. Second, the emergence of the projects has created a new way to conduct the "developmental" role for the social studies thereby separating the "developmental" and "educational" roles. This is to be called the "role conflict" theory. Third, those who conceived, developed, and promoted the NSS, viz., the project directors and staffs have a set of values about social studies different from the values of the typical teacher educator. This is referred to as the "value conflict" theory.

Let us first examine the "obsolescence" theory. Has the NSS threatened to make the skills and knowledge of methods teachers obsolete? This may indeed be the case. Consider, for instance, the following figures taken from the study:

Academic training of method teachers primarily in:

0	(1)	Anthropology
4	(2)	Economics
32	(3)	Education
1	(4)	Geography
42	(5)	History
14	(6)	Political Science
1	(7)	Psychology
3	(8)	Sociology
5	(9)	(Other)

It is generally agreed by teacher educators that the NSS draws heavily on the social sciences and tends to deemphasize history. However, methods teachers are not well-prepared for this shift since according to the above figures, almost 75% consider their primary academic training to have been in either education or history, neither of which is closely associated with the NSS. In addition, the "structure of a discipline" approach of the NSS

makes it difficult, if not impossible, for every methods teacher to be his own sociologist, his own anthropologist, his own political scientist, etc. The NSS calls for a combination of breadth and specialization that is almost impossible to find in any one methods teacher or even in any one social studies teacher education program. At a minimum, the NSS has placed heavy pressures on methods teachers to acquire new skills. Consequently, methods teachers may tend to resist some of the contributions of the projects because the projects have created new expectations for methods instruction and methods teachers are not prepared to meet these expectations.

What solutions are available, if we accept the obsolescence theory? Methods teachers could be "retreaded;" they could learn some of the new skills and knowledge required by the NSS in job-retraining programs. To what extent have the projects made any effort to bridge this gap? My answer is that this effort has been minimal at the most. Some projects, the HSGP is a good example, have put together some smaller packages to be used in pre-service courses and have organized institutes to familiarize methods teachers with the content and processes of the NSS. However, this seems to be the exception, rather than the rule.

In truth, the primary "educational" effort of the projects has been focused on in-service education. This emphasis on in-service education has had the effect of separating the interests of the projects and many methods teachers. Consequently, methods teachers have found themselves in the backwaters of social studies education with the lion's share of project "educational" money and resources going to aggressive and alert school districts and high school social studies departments. Not much of this project energy

has been directly injected into schools of education. The result has been that many local social studies departments have greater access to the NSS than do methods teachers in the schools of education which prepare the teachers for these same schools. Needless to say, this has created problems for methods teachers.

This circumvention of methods educators was a mistake. Given the limited resources available to projects for "educational" purposes, in the long run it would have been more efficient and productive for the projects to have become selectively involved in pre-service education, thereby taking advantage of what might be called the "multiplier effect." The "multiplier-effect" is based on the belief that a young, enthusiastic beginning teacher is likely to "infect" more colleagues during his professional career with this enthusiasm than is an experienced teacher. Also this would have created a cadre of skilled university professors who could have given great impetus to the NSS. And since methods teachers are gate-keepers, the original investment would have been returned many times over.

But even if projects decided to give high priority to the education and "retreading" of methods teachers, it would now be more difficult than five years ago. My feeling is that the most opportune time to convince methods educators of the overriding value of project-based curriculum development has been missed. The growing edge of social studies education is moving away from some of the main assumptions of the NSS. For example, some social studies educators are now beginning to question the notion that education is to be equated with formal schooling, an assumption never questioned by the NSS. However, whatever these future developments turn out to be, they will have been seriously impoverished by the fact that the NSS never had a hard

thrust into the sanctuaries of teacher education. Post-NSS developments will be less productive because many methods teachers will probably move from the pre- to the post-NSS eras without learning the skills and adopting the values of the NSS itself. It could have been otherwise if the projects had had the foresight (and the resources) to recognize that the "education" of teachers of teachers was essential for the long-range maintenance of the NSS.

Turning now to the "role conflict" theory, let us assume that the emergence of the projects created a new and different way to fulfill the "developmental" role for the social studies. This new kind of development has tended to separate the "developmental" and "educational" roles which previously had often been embodied in the same person. In the pre-NSS era, methods teachers were often the authors of textbooks and materials used both in schools and in their own pre-service classes.

If this splitting of roles is the source of the uneasiness expressed by methods teachers, then the most obvious solution is to ensure that more developers have a sense of the problems of teacher education and that more teacher educators taste the discipline and accountability that go into the development of a curriculum product. The answer may not be that simple.

It is a possibility that the simultaneous fulfillment of both roles is contradictory and undesirable. Project curriculum developers (or textbook writers) are always constrained by the harsh facts and broad generalizations of school reality. For example, they are more likely to get their materials into the schools if they develop courses that are almost universally required such as 9th grade civics or 11th grade U.S. History. Therefore it doesn't make much sense to package a curriculum or write a text on interdisciplinary American Studies, simply because there is no existing slot for such a course and consequently it would not sell. National projects are

no different from text writers in this respect, they simply cannot afford to question or ignore many of these fundamental realities; in the broadest sense they have to develop their curriculum around what already is there. Universities, on the other hand, including education professors, have the role of questioning existing realities. Indeed, universities and education professors have the responsibility of building ideal models and comparing practice to these ideals.

So how does one whose life style has been defined by doing the "possible" shift his thinking toward abstract ideals; or, how does the social critic get involved in the same developmental activities he has so often criticized? Such a dilemma can destroy or it can stimulate, depending upon how one handles it.

As a partial solution, perhaps the most overlooked angle of curriculum development in the NSS is the opportunity for materials developers and methods teachers to collaborate in the development of NSS packages for use in pre-service education. Collaboration at this point would go far toward bridging the gap in terms of both the "obsolescence" and the "role conflict" theories. I suppose it could be argued that this is not profitable because the big market is in the elementary and high schools, not in materials for college students. My answer is that this view is terribly short sighted and more than a little cynical; in either case, it is not in the best interests of the whole profession.

Lastly, let us examine the "value conflict" theory. Seemingly, at the heart of the differences between the materials projects and methods teachers is a conflicting view of the appropriate role of a social studies teacher. I personally believe that this explains most of the dissatisfaction.

Methods teachers tend to see teachers as developers and inventors of their own curricula; and the projects do not, at least as the projects are perceived by methods teachers.

Among the reasons that methods teachers want to drastically reduce the developmental role of the projects and even more sharply increase the classroom teacher's developmental role is that methods teachers tend to want a kind of social studies that is not easily packaged. As previously noted, teacher educators want more community learning activities, more social action, and more emphasis on the affective domain. Curriculum development is viewed as a situational task, dependent upon the unique characteristics of the people and events involved. It follows that what pre-service social studies teachers need to learn are broad principles of developing a student-centered, community-oriented curriculum, not the specific details of a large number of pre-packaged curricula.

George Mannello, Hofstra University, summed up the value difference between the project developers and teacher educators with this cogent statement:

> Thus, we come back to the teacher, not as an important component of an instructional system but as the center upon which the entire program hinges. There are overarching teacher qualities such as caring, commitment, responsibility and creativity. Without them no educational program no matter how well organized can succeed -- not in the long run. For example, we can visualize a situation in which an instructional system [pre-packaged curriculum] has been generally established for some time and its novelty has worn off. It is quite conceivable that a large number of teachers may follow, cookbook recipe style, the teaching units and lesson plans constructed by experts in just as mechanical and dissociated a manner as in the textbook teaching that systems analysts [project directors] inveigh against. What is to be gained? There is no point in substituting for one "slavish" method (going through the textbook page by page) another method that is apt to become slavish (ticking off the teaching unit). At least in the former the teacher can be less slavish, if he is so

> motivated. In the systems approach, however, with everything so neatly laid out, with materials and strategies so explicit, with the built-in expectation of conformity, the tendency will be to fall into one's place, to become "other-directed." When the teacher loses his feeling of centrality in the teacher-learning act the overarching qualities of good teaching . . . diminish. Instead, he may come to regard himself, just as the analysts say, one of a number of inter-acting parts, and as in any standardized machine replaceable with another identical part. It is dehumanizing.
>
> It is also deprofessionalizing. The teacher who no longer creates, organizes, and directs according to his own perceptions cannot be regarded as a fullfledged professional. He becomes a technician who implements someone else's findings.*

Teacher educators tend to believe that involvement in the very process of curriculum development is a central attribute of a successful social studies teacher. It is assumed that this involvement in curriculum development will have direct pay-off in the teaching process. (This assumption needs to be tested and offers a rich area for research in social studies education).

It is unlikely that those methods teachers who believe in the overriding value of locally-invented curricula will ever be entirely comfortable with the project conception of development. One possible way of at least narrowing the value gap is to make curriculum development an important and integral part of our pre-service teacher education programs. I doubt if this can be accomplished within the structure of most existing teacher education programs. The pressures of "survival" mitigate against any extensive and s systematic participation by student teachers in significant curriculum development programs in their schools. However, if we were to think of Intern programs lasting over one or two year periods, with Interns placed in good schools, and in charge of their own classes, a variety of options begin to emerge.

---

* Resource Unit Versus Instructional System (Mimeo) n.d.

With such a program the pre- and in-service distinction begins to blur. This paper is already too long so I had better conclude. However, I can give a couple of examples later in the discussion if anyone is interested, and I suspect that members of the audience also have good examples. The important point is that if methods educators are really committed to the importance of locally-invented curricula, then we ought to be giving much greater attention to fundamental changes in the structure and organization of teacher education. Only then can we deal more centrally with the difficult problems of developing curricula in real school situations. This will call for a much closer relationship between teacher education programs and local schools.

Summary:

My purpose in this essay has been to inquire into the impact of the NSS insofar as it is seen through the eyes of social studies methods teachers. It was noted that methods teachers tend to equate the NSS with the major curriculum development projects. Methods teachers tend to agree with many of the values of the NSS and the curriculum projects but they also tend to be very dissatisfied with the strong developmental role played by the projects in creating and maintaining the NSS. Overwhelmingly, they want the "developmental" role shifted from the projects to teachers in the field. In addition, methods teachers are dissatisfied with specific dimensions of the NSS. Basically, they see the NSS as overly academic, cerebral, and teacher-centered. They want more emphasis on student interests, community activities, social action, and the affective domain qualities difficult to pre-package. Also, methods teachers who hold appointments in schools of education tend to

be more dissatisfied with the NSS than methods teachers who hold appointments in an academic department.

The dissatisfaction of methods teachers can possibly be explained by any one or a combination of three different theories: These are 1) the "obsolescence" theory; 2) the "role conflict" theory; or 3) the "value conflict" theory. The writer sees the value-conflict theory as being the most explanatory of the three. It also describes the situation most difficult to deal with because it reflects fundamental differences about the nature of a "good" social studies program.

I have tried to surface some of the issues between methods teachers and curriculum projects and give some initial, intellectual structure to these issues so that we can begin to get a clearer picture of what is happening in our profession today. The social studies profession is undergoing a period of flux, letting a "hundred flowers bloom," as it were. The tension that exists between teacher educators and the curriculum projects is a major dimension of this period of flux. Roles and values are changing.

The broad metaphor of "identity crisis" pretty well characterizes what is happening to us. Over the past decade we have raised some new and basic questions about who we are and what we are supposed to be doing in schools as social studies educators. The projects have literally forced this beneficial reevaluation. Yes, tension does exist. But if it can be viewed as the growing pains of a profession seeking its identity, the tension can be viewed as part of the natural order of things. It can be creative rather than destructive.

Table One

Educational Link

According to methods teachers, the major educational link for the pre-service social studies teacher between the theory and practice of recent developments:

Educational Link	"is"	"ought-to-be"
	Rank	
Curriculum and Instruction (methods) Courses in Schools of Education	1	1
Academic Course Work	2	2
Professional Organizations (Publications, Meetings, etc.)	3	3
Workshops, Institutes, or Teacher Education Programs not Sponsored by a Development Project	4	4
Workshops, Institutes, or Teacher Education Programs Sponsored by a Development Project	5	5
Regional R&D Laboratories(ESEA)	6	6

Table Two

Developmental Contributors

According to methods teachers, the most significant developmental contributors to recent activity in the social studies:

Contributor	"are"	"ought-to-be"
	Rank	
Social Studies Projects (USOE, NSF, etc.).	1	3
Professional Organizations (NCSS, etc.).	2	2
Schools of Education	3	4
Academic Departments of Colleges and Universities	4	5
Classroom Teachers	5	1
State Departments of Public Instruction	6	6
School Administrators	7	7

METHODS TEACHERS AND THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES (NSS) Appendix II

COMPARATIVE WORD PAIRS

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS. (a)	DID (b)
Very High Agreement (65% or more)				
		Variable Labels (Word Pairs)		
94%	(N=95)	Discussion compared with Lecture	44%	.046
93%	(N=96)	Social Science Concepts c/w Historical Personalities	56%	.178
92%	(N=98)	Generalizations c/w Specific Facts	51%	.255
90%	(N=95)	Values of Scientific Inquiry c/w <u>Patriotic Values</u>	59%	.331*
	(N=96)	Relationships Among Events c/w Specific Facts	38%	.158
89%	(N=96)	Multiple Classroom Resources c/w Single Classroom Resource	39%	.180
88%	(N=94)	Student Talk c/w Teacher Talk	50%	.120
86%	(N=93)	Cosmopolitanism c/w Ethnocentrism	51%	.294
	(N=97)	Thematic History c/w Chronological History	51%	.216
	(N=91)	Cultural Pluralism c/w Cultural Consensus	51%	.098

(a) Indicates a relative shift between the "Are-being" and the "Ought-to-be" emphasized characteristics of the NSS on a five-point response scale: Agree Strongly, Agree, Equal, Agree, and Agree Strongly. Does <u>not</u> indicate the direction of this shift.

(b) DID is the Directional Intensity of Dissatisfaction Index.

$$DID = \frac{ME^1 - ME^2}{ME^1 + ME^2}$$

Where ME_2^1 = the % of respondents desiring more emphasis on Variable 1; and
ME^2 = the % of respondents wanting more emphasis on Variable 2.
(Variable 1 is always the variable with the larger raw number).

DID indicates the "intensity" to which a particular word-variable is preferred over its counterpart. The larger the DID, the greater the intensity. On only those items of statistical significance, (marked with either an "*" or "**") is the preferred variable <u>underlined</u>. (E.G., see Values of Scientific Inquiry c/w <u>Patriotic Values</u> above).

*)
**) $X^2 = \frac{(|A - D| - 1)^2}{A+D}$ with ($p < .05$)

* = expanded format: using all five categories on the response scale to construct a 2x2 contingency table. (liberal calculation)

** = collapsed format: combining agree strongly and agree categories and eliminating the equal category to construct a 2x2 contingency table. (conservative calculation)

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS. (a)	DID (b)
Very High Agreement (65% or more)				
		Variable Labels (Word Pairs)		
82%	(N=95)	"Open-ended" Divergent Inquiry c/w "Closed" Convergent Inquiry	42%	.334*
80%	(N=97)	Social Science c/w History	51%	.098
78%	(N=96)	Process c/w Content	60%	.033
77%	(N=97)	Controversial Topics c/w Non-controversial Topics	55%	.491*
	(N=95)	Interpretation of Social Phenomena c/w Description of Social Phenomena	66%	.061
76%	(N=91)	Value Clarification c/w Value Commitment	63%	.324*
	(N=96)	Reconstruction of Values c/w Conservation of Values	54%	.146
73%	(N=93)	Value-included Inquiry c/w Value-excluded Inquiry	56%	.607*
72%	(N=95)	The Present c/w the Past	52%	.000
71%	(N=87)	Social Science c/w Philosophy	60%	.568**
66%	(N=83)	Human Significance c/w Human Efficiency	60%	.567*
65%	(N=92)	Problem-solving Ability c/w Problem-finding Ability	55%	.164
	(N=93)	Rationality c/w Intuition	57%	.053
	(N-93)	Cultural Reality c/w Cultural Ideals	59%	.051
High Agreement (50% to 64%)				
63%	(N=93)	Comparative History c/w National History	61%	.334*
62%	(N=96)	The Present c/w The Future	66%	.425*
61%	(N=89)	Social Science c/w Social Studies	67%	.523**
60%	(N=97)	Interdisciplinary Curricula c/w Separate Discipline Curricula	59%	.424*

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix II

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS. (a)	DID (b)
High Agreement (50% to 64%, cont'd.)		**Variable Labels (Word Pairs)**		
59%	(N=91)	Social Systems c/w Individuals	57%	.509*
	(N=93)	Cognitive Domain c/w Affective Domain	78%	.488*
	(N=96)	Discussion Skill c/w Reading Skill	65%	.446*
	(N=90)	Objectivity c/w Subjectivity	52%	.154
57%	(N=98)	Classroom Activities c/w Community Activities	76%	.684**
	(N=93)	The Future c/w the Past	62%	.193
54%	(N=98)	Pre-packaged Content c/w Teacher-developed Content	66%	.819*
51%	(N=97)	Self-concept Development c/w Academic Achievement	74%	.298*
50%	(N=95)	Social Science c/w Social Action	69%	.420**
Low Agreement (49% or less)				
48%	(N=96)	Curriculum Materials Development c/w Teaching Methodology	62%	.517*
	(N=98)	Academically Above-average Students c/w Academically Below-Average Students	70%	.485*
47%	(N=94)	Melioration of Social Problems c/w Knowledge of Academic Disciplines	69%	.595*
	(N=93)	National Curriculum Development (USOE, NSF, etc.) c/w Local Curriculum Development	74%	.460**
	(N=90)	Political Efficacy c/w Political Knowledge	63%	.143
46%	(N=98)	Independent Study c/w Group Study	57%	.193
45%	(N=93)	History as a Humanistic Discipline c/w History as a Scientific Discipline	65%	.323*
44%	(N=93)	In-service Teacher Education c/w Pre-service Teacher Education	72%	.139
43%	(N=89)	Descriptive Problems c/w Normative Problems	63%	.460*

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix II.

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS (a)	DID (b)
Low Agreement (59% or less, cont'd.)				
		Variable Labels (Word Pairs)		
42%	(N=98)	Student Interests c/w Academic Disciplines	70%	.429*
41%	(N=92)	General Education Values c/w Scholarly Research Values	68%	.412*
38%	(N=85)	Heterogeneous Classes c/w Homogeneous Classes	72%	.472*

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix II.

METHODS TEACHERS AND THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES
AGREE - DISAGREE, LICKERT TYPE

Appendix III

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS (a)	DID (b)
Very High Agreement (65% or more)				
		THE NSS IS EMPHASIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF . . .		
76%	(N=99)	. dealing with the problems of disadvantaged minority groups in our society. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	60%	.633*
69%	(N=99)	. flexible patterns of classroom management, e.g., seating and behavior rules. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	66%	.729*
69%	(N=99)	. measurable performance objectives (More Emphasis/ Less Emphasis)	59%	.594*
66%	(N=99)	. increased academic freedom for secondary social studies teachers. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	69%	.740*
High Agreement (50% to 64%)				
64%	(N=99)	. curriculum development viewed as a process of "adoption of pre-packaged curricula" by local schools, departments, teachers, etc. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.739**
51%	(N=99)	. student planned goals and activities. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.465**
Low Agreement (49% or less)				
45%	(N=98)	. social action as a planned-for outcome of instruction. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	65%	.477*
41%	(N=99)	. maintaining the 'integrity" of the separate disciplines. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	64%	.530**
40%	(N=99)	. increased civil rights for high school students. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.635*
34%	(N=99)	. the assumption that the classroom teacher is the key agent for developing and promoting major curriculum changes. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.661**
33%	(N=99)	. curriculum development viewed as a process of "invention" by local schools, departments, teachers, etc. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	62%	.679**
30%	(N=100)	. historical content (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	66%	.067

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix II.